



#13

Attorney's Do. No. 1705-016 8-4-03  
EWG-050-C3 TRR

<b>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING</b>	
I hereby certify that on <u>July 21, 2003</u> this document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service, with sufficient postage, as <b>First Class Mail</b> addressed to	
Mail Stop: Appeal Brief - Patents Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	<b>RECEIVED</b>  JUL 28 2003  Technology Center 2600
by: <u>Elmer Galbi</u> Reg No 19761	

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application:  <b>Serial No.:</b> <u>10/039,928</u>  <b>Inventors:</b> <u>David Y. Schlossman et.al.</u>  <b>Filed:</b> <u>October 29, 2001</u>  <b>For:</b> <u>INTELLIGENT CONFIGURATION SERVER</u>	<b>Group No.:</b> <u>2643</u>    <b>Examiner:</b> <u>Nguyen, Duc</u>
---	--

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Reply Brief**

The examiner's answer contain a misstatement concerning applicant's position.

The examiner's answer states (with **bold** and underlining as in the examiner's answer):

"it is noted that the features upon which appellant relies (i.e. **'call detail records'** showing the **normal operation** of the system are analyzed to determine what type of system generated this records) and (the system claimed by the appellant

utilizes information about the actual operation of the system in order to configure the system) are not recited in the rejected claim(s)”

Applicant has never relied on “call detail records” to distinguish the claims over the prior art. In the specifications, and in appellant’s brief, “call detail records” are merely referred to an example of how one can “record details of the operation of a communication system”.

Applicant’s claims (for example claim 7) call for:

“recording details of the operation of said communication system; ...

....

examining said details of operation and generating identification data identifying said communication system ..

utilizing said identification information to facilitate configuration of said communication system”.

Contrary to what the examiner states, applicant’s position relies on the fact that the references do not teach “recording details of the operation of a communication system” and using the recorded information to identify the communication system and then to configure the system.

Contrary to what the examiner states, the references do not teach or suggest, recording details of the operation of a system and then using those recorded details to identify the system. The reference teaches using “configuration” information obtained by an installer or “configuration” information recorded in the system.

For the above reasons and for the other reasons explained in appellant's brief, appellant respectfully requests reversal of the examiner's rejection.

by the undersigned attorney of record,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Elmer W. Galbi", written over a horizontal line.

Elmer W. Galbi  
Reg. No. 19,761

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM  
1030 SW Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205  
(503) 222-3613